

A
LETTER
TO

Dr. SNAPPE,

Occasion'd by his LETTER to the

Bishop of BANGOR.

WHEREIN

The Doctor is Answer'd and Expos'd,
Paragraph by Paragraph.

By a LAYMAN of Conscience and
Common Sense.

THE FOURTH EDITION.

L O N D O N,
Printed; and Sold by J. Roberts in
Warwick Lane. MDCCXVII.

[Price Six Pence.]

A
 L E T T E R
 T O
 Dr. *S N A P E*, &c.

DOCTOR,

THAT Trouble, which you intended the Bishop of *Bangor*, is now given *You* by a Person wholly a Stranger to *You*, and who desires to continue so: But yet by one who having neither Capacity nor Leisure to set you in a proper and full Light, has a strong Inclination to point out some Parts of your Letter, which are by some Mistake or other mix'd up of Nonsense, Absurdity, Injustice and Uncharitableness: And I leave the World to judge whether I shall or no.

In the Third Page you say, *you have very little either of Capacity, Inclination or Leisure to engage in Controversy.* In
 A 2 the

the Fourth, you declare, That notwithstanding all these Dissuasives, you can't prevail with your self to sit as an unconcerned Spectator, &c. Where you must mean, that notwithstanding all these Dissuasives, you have a strong Inclination to enter into Controversy, for which you have very little Inclination: As for Capacity and Leisure, you may perhaps have spoke Truth; at least, your Performance shews you have very little of either.

It seems you think, that *the Mistakes in his Lordship's late Writings, which have given so general an Offence, will be set in a clear Light by Persons much better Qualified.* Why cou'd not you have let 'em alone then? or why must you proceed to call these Mistakes *Principles, which in your Apprehension manifestly tend to the Dissolution of the whole Frame and Constitution of the Church:* But otherwise you cou'd not have shewn your *Apprehension and Charity.*

But why this idle long Preamble before you come to the Purpose, when you have so little *Leisure?* But alas, when do you come to the Purpose! In the next Paragraph you wittily observe, that *you have the same Right to offer your Exceptions to a Sermon of his Lordship's, which*
him.

himself thought fit to assume when but a Presbyterian in censuring a Discourse of a late excellent and worthy Prelate. It is true you have; but let that *Prelate* be excellent in whatever besides, he was certainly excell'd by the *Presbyter* in that Controversy; so far conquer'd, that he was given up by the Brethren of his Opinion, without the least Opposition. A Conquest which the present *Presbyter* has very little Reason to expect.

You spend another Paragraph in representing his Lordship's *Doctrines as new and strange, and entirely Destructive of all Order and Government, of all Unity, Peace, and Communion in the Church, contradictory to the Scriptures, &c.* Whereas his Lordship only contends, that the Consciences of Men ought to have no Compulsion laid upon them. And I ask you and all the World, whether they suppose the Unity of the Church consists in an Agreement of Opinions, or a Congregation of Bodies? Unity and Concord, in the Faith which Christ has taught us, must exist in and proceed from the Mind; and if, by offering to impose upon People more than Christ has taught, as necessary to Salvation, you cou'd violently force and drive their Bodies into one manner of Congregation, or set of Circum-

cumstantial, wou'd there be ever the more Unity or Concord in this? No; but ten thousand Heart-burnings and broilings of Spirit, provok'd by Persecution and ill Usage. In short, whatever his Lordship means, or whatever you may think; whoever agree in the same Faith, the same Hope, the same Baptism that the Lord Jesus taught, do preserve Unity amongst them; tho' the Nation were divided into a Million of Congregations with as many different Forms and Ceremonies. If not, why did our Lord say, Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I am in the midst of them? and if God be with us, who can be against us? or how canst thou curse those whom God hath blessed?

In the next Paragraph, *you think you see the Will of God otherwise than is represented by his Lordship.* If you mean in *Essentials*, pray what Religion are you of? for his Lordship has not given the least room for Doubt, that he contends for any other Faith than what was once deliver'd to the Saints. If you mean in *Circumstantial and Ceremonies*; pray shew where the Will of God has determin'd, that any particular Sett shall be a Necessary Qualification for Salvation. *From his Lordship's Principles, it seems*
you

you think you might express your self with an unbounded Freedom in a matter of Religion and Conscience. Notwithstanding which, you say, you will take care to proceed with a due Regard to his Episcopal Character, and some to your own Safety. By which you certainly mean; that were it not for fear of incurring the Penalty of *scandalum magnatum*, and exposing some of your Favourite Bishops to the same Affronts; you wou'd call his Lordship *Atheist, Rogue, and Rascal*; whereas now you only leave your gentle Readers to infer from your Premises what he is. But pray, Doctor, what unwarrantable and obnoxious Appellation, can your inward Conviction and private Belief suggest to you, which can be consistent with a Matter of Religion and Conscience? You know not what manner of Spirit you are of.

Your next Paragraph is spent, as in the Paragraph after that you own, in a needless Digression. How cou'd you, who complain so much of want of Leisure, make a Digression which you thought needless? But now you make amends by saying. *let us see how his Lordship makes good the Point.*

And here you agree with his Lordship in the Discussion of these two Points, Religion,

ligion, and the Worship of God, and think there are too many who lay too great a stress on the external Circumstantials of Religion; very well. But when you come to apprehend that the Bishop is striking at the very Root of all Goodness, depreciating the solemn Duty of Prayer, and separating the Life and Soul from it, that is murdering of it, how shockingly are you disappointed!

Doctor, I'll tell you what; I am not very rich, and withall something covetous, which I flatter my self is only Frugality. But when I saw in the Advertisements three or four Days before Publication, that a Letter was coming out from *Andrew Snape D. D. occasion'd by the Bishop of Bangor's Sermon before the King*, I long'd 'till I saw it; from a received Character that Doctor *Snape* was a Man of Learning and good Sense; as indeed the Post he is in, of being Headmaster to the finest School in the World, justly requires. It seems the Letter was Publisht on *Monday*; on *Tuesday* Morning I met with it (being then just come out of the Country) with the second Edition added to the Title Page; which made me think it had Sold hugely the Day before, and they had been up all Night a setting the Press for it again.

This

This rais'd my Curiosity; and I promised my self strength of Argument, good Sense and Breeding, and a noble Scene of Controversy open'd: But when I had paid my Six Pence, and perus'd my Purchase, *how shockingly was I disappointed?*

If this Digression shou'd be thought needless, I ask Pardon of those to whom it may seem so, but assure 'em I did not think it so my self.

But to return; I believe, Doctor, your shocking Disappointment proceeds from your not being able to prove what you so roundly charge his Lordship with. For who besides your self can think that he is *striking at the Root of all Goodness*; when he is only blaming the indiscreet Redundance and Disorder of a misapplied Zeal?

What, Doctor, and because the Bishop thinks it improper that People shou'd lay too great a Stress upon an extatic, furious or shewish Behaviour in offering their Addresses to God, will you say that he depreciates the Duty of Prayer it self; which must be made solemn by the Mind more than the Body, or it will never be accepted? Must then at last the *Quakers* Emotions and Agitations of the Spirit, as they call it, tho' 'tis express'd by the Body, be pleaded

B

for

for and defended ; and by a Doctor of the Church of *England*? Consider what a handle you may give those Enemies to the Church, and retract your Assertions in Time: Shew where the Bishop depreciates the Duty of Prayer, or own your Mistake, and ask his Pardon.

His Lordship, speaking of Prayer, is *pleas'd to call it a calm and undisturb'd Address to God*; which gives you a great deal of Disturbance, and ruffles your Temper much: You say there are no such Directions in Scripture: But are there any Directions to prove that Prayer must be other than a *calm and undisturb'd Address*? What wou'd it be if it were not so? Why you say the Scriptures tell us, *Men ought always to pray and not to faint*: Does that imply their Prayers must be other than calm and undisturb'd, how frequent soever? As for the Directions our Lord gives to ask, and seek, and knock; they are Metaphors for Prayer, without which we ought not to expect a Supply of our Wants: If you contend they are mention'd for our Imitation, and Prayer is to be executed with the same Diligence that People use in asking, seeking and knocking; I dare aver whoever asks for any Favour, and seeks for any lost Thing in a calm and undisturb'd Composure of Mind, will
 sooner

sooner have his Request granted and find what he looks for, than if he ask'd and sought with Importunity and Hurry. As for knocking, that only implies a frequent Repetition of the same Address, till we find an Admittance open'd to our Desires

To pass by your mannerly Supposition of the Bishop's Temper in saying the *Lord's Prayer*, I'd fain know why a due Degree of warmth and liveliness of Spirit may not accompany an Address, deliver'd by a Body calm and undisturb'd? What! Does not God know the Heart? Must we shew him by some outward and visible sign that we are in earnest? Or will nothing but Raving and Distortion of the Parts of the Body please him?

Next you tell us that our Saviour's Will in this Case is that we shou'd pray as he did, *when being in an Agony he pray'd more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great Drops of Blood falling down to the Ground.* Pray, Doctor, are you, or can you ever, be in such an Agony? Or can there ever be occasion for any Body to be in such an Agony again? No sure. Propose an Instance of our Saviour's ever praying after the manner you plead for in a Case of less Emergency, and it may be made an Example;

till then, his Lordship need not be asham'd, to have the World think that he is more *indolent* and *unmov'd* in his ordinary Devotions than *Jesus* the Saviour of the World was, when he was in an Agony, and going to bear the Punishment due to the Guilt of all Mankind. But besides, I must here put you in mind that you have forgot the two Epithets, *Calm* and *Undisturb'd*, and put two others in their stead, which you think will serve your Purpose much better, *indolent* and *unmov'd* An easie Mistake; Charity covers a Multitude of Sins: And so let it pass.

As for the other Texts you quote of *labouring fervently in Prayer*, &c. I must once for all tell you, that reasonable People will suppose *that Fervency* to be a labouring of the Mind in the Composition and Aptness of an Address, and not of the Body in the Delivery of it. For if it were otherwise, according to your Notions, People that had Occasion to pray much, must be so fatigued in the End, that they cou'd not be at *Leisure* for any temporal Labour: Nay, the Ladies, and some others of weak Constitutions and strong Zeal, after these Agonies would come off well if they miss'd a fit of Sicknes, or escap'd catching a violent Cold.

Cold. This is really Truth, tho' your Charity may make you think it in me a *downright Burlesque of our Saviour's Agony*; however the venerable Name in the Front of his Lordship's Sermon, prevented you from speaking so of him.

But, (to make a Digression here, not at all needless,) if Prayers are to be *so fervent a labouring of the Body*; (for the inward Meaning may be fervent, while the Address is *calm and undisturb'd*, however those two Words may have displeas'd you) why don't all our Ministers and Readers give us some Specimen of it in their daily Practice? As it is, we reckon him the best Reader who is the most *calm and undisturb'd* in his Elocution, and performs the Divine Service in so smooth and agreeable a Tone, as the Audience can best hear and accompany him in. Methinks it would be fine and Seraphick to hear the *Confession, Lord's Prayer, Creed, Psalms, &c.* repeated by the whole Congregation at once in a manner less *calm and undisturb'd* than they are at present.

But now we are come *to the Point*. As you have been all this while interpreting the Bishop's Meaning in a peculiar Sense of your own, for fear he should find some Hole to creep out at, you are resolv'd

solv'd to secure him; in order to do which you pronounce that his Readers will not understand those qualifying Phrases *in such a manner, and to such a Degree*, by which his Lordship thinks to moderate *what appears so offensive*. What, are you resolv'd to give his Lordship no Quarter? No, if you had him but once sure in your Clutches: and if understanding his Words and Periods otherwise than he meant 'em, and they signify in the common Acceptation, if guessing at his Pronunciation, or any other Guess-Work wou'd do the Business, *Lord have mercy upon the poor Bishop!*

Your next Paragraph asserts, that his Lordship *opposes Heat and Flame to Calmness and Undisturbedness in our Addresses to God*; and from thence you infer that he *means to stifle all pious Breathings of the Soul, &c. that he leaves no room for Elevation of Thought in contemplating the Majesty of God, for Acts of Shame, Abhorrence, and godly Contrition*, with a Catalogue of the different Passions the Soul is to assume upon different Occasions. What strange Misconstruction and Misapplication is this! without any Regard to Reason, Sense or Christianity. Why, Doctor, is it not possible that a Man may appear calm and undisturbed, and yet have

have a passionate Desire for some very desirable temporal Object? and may not the Soul have its pious Breathings without running it self out of Breath; and be warm in its Devotions, without the Sparks flying about our Ears? Cannot I in my Country-walk upon a fine genial springly Day feel an Elevation of Thought in contemplating the Majesty of God, without hallooing and whooping and swinging my Hat over my Head, as the Clowns do at a County Election, that the Knight of the Shire may see who were his Friends? And why may not a Man of Sense and Reason feel in himself the utmost Satisfaction from God's Benefits, and be fill'd with Gratitude in an Acknowledgment of 'em in the House of God, or his own Closet, without breaking out into one of your Flames, and losing his Senses in an assum'd Transport? For such it must be, if you teach People Flame with their Devotions; since all are not of a Spriteliness and Volatility to kindle alike by natural Instinct. But then, as for Acts of *Shame* and *Abhorrence*, which you say it is so necessary to shew, if they are to consist of any thing more than a Contrition of Mind and inward Detestation, pray shew your Authority for it: in the mean time take one Text of Scripture

ture

ture against it, which will weigh with me beyond all you can bring for it, in the Words of our Blessed Lord: *When ye fast, be not like the Hypocrites of a sad Countenance; for they disfigure their Faces that they may appear unto Men to Fast, &c.* God requires of us *there* a chearful Countenance, while we are Fasting and doing Acts of Contrition; and that we should appear privately and inwardly to him to fast, because he sees the Heart. But this, Doctor, I am afraid will hardly keep you from wearing a sad Countenance next publick Fast.

What Influence your Doctrines will have, or what Adherents you will gain over, I can easily foresee: For there is a large Number of those who will think it adviseable to list themselves in your new Sect of *Christian Pharisees*; tho' you have not thought fit to make the Bishop any such Compliment.

In the next Paragraph, you are offended with his Lordship for *having plac'd the Love of God as low as possible*; and tell us, *That he seems particularly careful that Men may not offend in the Excess of this, or any Thing else that's Good.* Are not you ashamed, Doctor, to talk thus to a worthy Bishop, and then tell him that he *seems* to be so and so? His Lordship is
too

too conveniently intrench'd within the Barriers of Sense, Truth, and Strength of Argument, ever to be reach'd by such small Arms as *seems, appears, People will understand, &c.* We have too long been cajol'd and amus'd with *seems* and *appears*, with *Shadows* and *Varnish*, to let go *Truth* blooming and beautiful in her unaffected Charms, when once we have strain'd the Goddess in our Embrace. The Cloud which blindly and implicitly we have taken in her stead, has produc'd a Race of strange Monsters. But his Lordship, like another *Hercules*, is born for their Destruction; and 'tis not a Kick from one wincing *Centaure* that can discourage his Intentions. But let us see, Doctor, how his Lordship *has plac'd the Love of God as low as possible*. Why he says, That *the Love of God*, which we are given to understand by the Words of our Saviour, and St. *John*, many times repeated, consisted in *keeping his Commandments, or doing his Will*; is so far remov'd from the Thing principally intend'd, that it is come by Degrees to signify a violent *Passion, Commotion, and Ecstasy*, venting it self in such sort of Expressions and Disorders as other Passions do: From whence an ordinary *Christian*, with the utmost Sincerity in his Heart, is fill'd

C

with

with nothing but eternal *Doubts, Suspicions, and Perplexities*, whether he has any thing of the true Love of God or not. *So far the Bishop.* You are very Angry at this, and would have the *Love of God* be still so perverted in the meaning of it, as to keep *eternal Suspicions, Doubts and Perplexities* in the Minds of the poor People: If you do not mean this, why are you angry? why could not you let this Paragraph alone, unless you could have pointed out some Fallacy or Evil in it? But in saying the Bishop sets the *Love of God* as low as possible, and *seems particularly careful that Men may not offend in the Excess of any Thing that's Good*, you have your End; which is, to make his Lordship Odious to your bigotted Readers, because you think they will take what you say upon Trust, without examining his Lordship's Sermon; for the reading of that only to a Man of Common Sense, would confute every Word you have said, and make you appear full of Injustice and Falshood. How can you prevaricate so? Because his Lordship says, the Notion of the *Love of God* is perverted, and by false Interpreters made to signify, *Passion, Commotion, and Ecstasy*; therefore, say you, *He takes Care that Men shall not offend in the Excess of any Thing that's Good.*

Good. Is Passion, Commotion and Ecstasy the Excess of any Thing that's Good? So far from it, that they are certainly the contrary to all that's Good, when they come to fill the Heart of a Christian with *eternal Suspicions, Doubts, and Perplexities*. I have given this one Instance of your misrepresenting the Bishop's Sense, as a Specimen of your candid and fair Dealing thro' the whole Letter; every Paragraph of which has something as grossly false.

For in the next Paragraph you represent his Lordship as saying, That the *Church of Christ is a mysterious inexplicable Phrase, so full of inconsistent Images*—When you know his Lordship says, the Notion of the *Church of Christ* was at first *only the Number small or great of those that believ'd him to be the Messiah: Or of those who subjected themselves to Him, as their King, in the Affair of Religion*. This is a very plain conceivable Position; but his Lordship says, since that Time it has been so diversify'd by the various Alterations it has undergone, that it is almost impossible to number up the many *inconsistent Images* that have come by daily Additions to be united together in it. Don't

you perceive now, Doctor, that 'tis not the Bishop who makes it *an inexplicable mysterious Phrase full of inconsistent Images*, but some body else, who have made it their Craft to do so. You say the Bishop is pleas'd to infer *pag. 13.* by one of the oddest Consequences that ever was drawn from any Proposition, that *because* Christ never interposes himself *therefore* he has left no Deputy. Are not you asham'd to misrepresent a Man of Sense thus? His Lordship's Argument is thus; Since *Christ* never interposes *himself* since the first Promulgation of his Law, either to convey *Infallibility* to such as pretend to handle it over again, or to assert the *Interpretation* of it amidst the various and contradictory Opinions of Men about it; if such an *absolute Authority* be once lodged with Men under the Notion of *Interpreters*, They then become the *Legislators*, and not Christ; they rule in their own *Kingdom*, and not in *his*. What's become of your odd Inference now? Why you say, (seven Pages after this) that his Lordship may fancy he has a *Salvo* in reserve by guarding several Sentences with the Word *absolute*; but that shan't serve his turn with you; for

for you leave it out, *p.* 24. to see how prettily the Sentence looks without it, and then you venture to make your Construction. Such poor Shifts are you forc'd to make use of thro' the whole Tenor of your Letter.

You spend five needless Pages, before you recollect your self, in labouring to convince one of the Governors of *Christ's* Church, of the highest Order that *Christ* has left a Power of Governing. Indeed I believe the Bishop of *Ban-*
gor knows what he has to do, and how to execute the Trust committed to him; but if you had a mind to have convinc'd him of what he does not know, you shou'd have prov'd from Scripture that his Lordship, as one of the highest Order, has a Power of imposing what Interpretations of Scripture he thinks fit upon the unconvicted Consciences of the People; and of forcing an Assent and Compliance to what they scruple as a Sin: This wou'd have been a Privilege worth having, and what I believe his Lordship has not yet been persuaded belongs to him.

You talk a little about the Word *absolute*, and tell us the known Import of it; I hope we shall never feel what it imports.

imports. You say there is one Exception, and but one, by which our Obedience to all earthly Governors must be bounded; and that is, that their Commands be not disagreeable to the Laws of Christ. If by Governors, you mean Kings and their Arbitrary Commands, I'll tell you another Exception by which our Obedience to them must be bounded; and that is, that their Commands be not disagreeable to the Laws of the Land; which are what the Governors themselves ought to be govern'd by; and when once they have sworn to protect their People according to those Laws, if they go to impose any thing more of their own without Consent of the true Legislative Power, they may be resisted. Therefore that great Word *ABSOLUTE*, unless you can make less of it than you have hitherto done, will very well justify the Bishop in all his Assertions. And I further say, that whoever pretend to an *Absolute Power* that does not belong to them, tho' by that *Absolute Power* they do nothing contrary to the Scriptures, yet by assuming that *Absolute Power* which was never given them, they become Usurpers; and ought to be thrust out of their Usurpation, for fear they

they shou'd make an ill Use of it. Therefore, *this is not the saving which his Lordship had in View, and what he intends to provide for wherever he has inserted the Word Absolute, to mean those only who abuse this Power in interpreting the Scriptures wrongfully; but those who Usurp an absolute Power, which does not belong to them. Nor matters it at all whether they use it well or ill as long as they pretend it is Absolute. But you say, had he meant it in that Sense, a great deal of Offence wou'd still have remain'd; tho', you own, many of the Offensive Passages with which his Lordship's Sermon every where abounds, might have been alleviated by it.*

First you discard the Word *Absolute*, and then play your own Game; you say, whatever latent Reserve his Lordship intends by that Word, it is not that which alone can qualify the Grossness of his Assertions. But for fear that alone shou'd do it, you first throw it away, and then make the Bishop speak thus. “ Tho' we
 “ are taught by the Gospel to obey the
 “ Commands both of our Spiritual and
 “ Temporal Superiors, yet I say you
 “ must receive no Commands from any
 “ Superiors, whether Spiritual or Tem-
 “ poral,

“ poral, whether in Cafes lawful or unlawful, in Matters relating to Conscience. ” But is it not quite another Sense, when the Word *Absolute* is us'd ! And does not the Bishop assert that *they* are Kings in *Christ's* stead, and *Usurpers* of his Power, who pretend to be *Absolute* in the Interpretation of his Laws, by which they may make the Laws as they please ; and will you say that such ought to be obeyed, while they pretend to and challenge that *Absolute Power* ? No ; but you had dethron'd the Word *Absolute*, and then usurp'd a Power, without it, of interpreting the Bishop's Sense as you pleas'd.

And how can you, in the next Paragraph, declare that you have put no Force upon his Lordship's Words, or misinterpreted his Meaning ?

But, *to make this more fully manifest, that you have done him no Wrong*, you appeal to other Places of his Sermon, where he has advanc'd the same Notion in more *undisguis'd and peremptory Terms*, without mincing or palliating, without the least Guard of Caution. *Mincing or palliating* what ? *Guard of Caution*, for Fear of whom ? Is a Bishop then to *mince and palliate* still ? What, must

must it be always expected of them? And must he have a *Guard of Caution* too, when he Preaches the Word of God, for fear he shou'd beget Enemies, for telling the Truth? But what are these *undisguis'd and peremptory Terms*! why he says, *If any Man upon Earth have a Right to add to the Sanctions of Christ's Laws, &c. they are so far Kings in his stead, and reign in their own Kingdom, and not in his.* A very daring Affelevation indeed! say you: and repeat again, *If any Man upon Earth!* Now it happens in the Sermon to be, *If any Men upon Earth*; regarding, in all probability, a Set of Men who affect and claim that Power. But you make it *Man*, to frighten the Bishop with his questioning the Prerogative of the *King* or Privilege of *Parliament*, or something like that. But tho' all Legislative Powers have a Right to make Laws for the Encouragement of Virtue, and Punishment of Vice and Immorality; yet how can *they* possibly affect the Conscience in Speculations relating to Salvation; that which is call'd *Forum internum*, in Opposition to all External Courts whatsoever. If they had this Right, I hope you wou'd allow them to make use of it, and hang all

D

the

the *Nonjurors* and *Tories* in the Nation, if they did not immediately *appear* as hearty Subjects for the King as the *Whiggs*. But I am afraid our King and *Parliament* have neither *Power* nor *Right* to make People think as they'd have 'em; if they had, I believe, we shou'd at present be the happiest People upon Earth. Any Power may encourage Religion by Temporal Rewards, if they can think *that* any Religion, which can rise and fall by Reward; but, as you add, If any Man upon Earth has a Right to *discourage* Religion by Temporal Penalties, I insist upon it, that that is attempting to dethrone *Christ* from his Spiritual Kingdom. And can you say it is not? Where then is the *very daring Affeuration*!

You think it bears hard on the Acts for preventing *Occasional Conformity* and *Schism*; I am glad of it, I hope it does. But when you suppose that it strikes at all the *incapacitating Acts in Force*, I think you are mistaken: The *Papists* may be excluded and incapacitated very legally; not for Conscience or Speculation; but because the Principles of their Religion oblige 'em to such hellish Practices as wou'd soon overturn
our

our Constitution, if they were let loose upon us. Therefore the Nation has a Right *se defendendo* to tie up their Hands as it does; for, if their Religion wou'd suffer 'em to be good Subjects to our King, as they ought not, so I believe they wou'd not meet with any Hardship at all: But as it is, they suffer for those rebellious Principles and Tenets of Treachery which *Popes* and *Jesuits* have interwoven with that Religion with which they have enslav'd 'em. But the *Dissenters* happen to be such zealous Assertors of the Protestant Succession, and so true Advocates for the Constitution of our Government in Opposition to *Popery* and *Slavery*, that there can be no Pretence upon that Account to distinguish them from the best of the King's Subjects.

As for your wise Assertion, that by this Doctrine the Acts of *Settlement and Succession* are overthrown, it is too trifling to be thought of. As if the Nation, by enacting Civil Laws, had not a Power of strengthening its Constitution from time to time, without violating the Consciences of Men. It is not only more for Peace and good Government that the King shou'd be of the National Religion; but we know it is impossible

for a *Papist* to reign without attempting to make himself Arbitrary, and imposing his Religion upon his People. But how idle is your Supposition of a Crown's being a temporal Reward? We only require that our King must be of such a Religion or Profession; not that he must be more Religious than others: And as for your insinuating that the Expectations of enjoying a Crown may induce those who hope to succeed to it to chuse that Religion of which it is to be the Reward, we have taken Care that those who are to succeed to that of these Realms must be educated *Protestants*; which they are initiated in so Young, that it cannot be suppos'd the View of a Crown can have any Influence upon 'em. But as I observ'd before, when you talk thus, you must have an *Idea* of Religion as an empty Profession, without any regard to Conscience: For how can he that makes a Reward the Test of his Religion, be of any real Religion at all? since temporal Rewards and Punishments are so far from promoting true Religion in any respect, that wherever they are advanc'd and do influence, they must necessarily be the Destruction of Religion, and introduce Hypocrisy, Treachery, Falshood and Knavery.

You

You are angry, That the Bishop does not aim the least Glance at *Popery* in particular; when, considering the Subject, you think it could not well be avoided: Why, the Subject does require it; and in my Opinion, Doctor, his Lordship has been aiming all his Glances against *Popery* in particular, as well as *Popery* in General; the *Thing* I mean tho' not the *Name*: For it is *Things* and not *Names* that his Lordship always seems to reason by. But I believe, Doctor, you know there is such a thing as *Protestant Popery*; which I take to be the *Popery* there aim'd at, and which we seem to be in more Danger of, because it is nearer home, than of the *Popish Popery*. He speaks against all; or, as you say, *deals his Favours to all Churches and Religions*, with an undistinguish'd Hand, where they assume to themselves an *absolute Power* of imposing upon *Christians* their dogmatical Interpretations instead of the plain and manifest Precepts of *Christ*.

By this Time you may be convinc'd that the *dangerous Consequences arising from his Lordship's Positions*, that seem'd to you to affect the *State*, do only affect the *State of Popery*; as it is spread
more

more or less over all Parts of *Christendom*. But you beg Patience while you mention some other *dangerous Consequences* that concern the *Church*. Pray have Patience and keep it, while I ask you what you mean by the Word *Church*: His Lordship says, *It is the Number of Men, whether small or great, whether dispers'd or united, who truly and sincerely are Subjects to Jesus Christ alone, as their Law-giver and Judge, in Matters relating to the Favour of God and their eternal Salvation.* If you don't like this Definition why did not you protest against it, and give us one of your own? But I presume you have nothing to say against it. But by *Church*, Doctor, did not you mean the Clergy? confess, you did. If *Church* be what the Bishop says, the Clergy are scarce the thousandth Part of it. If by *Church* you mean the Clergy, I must confess, what his Lordship has said, seems to me to concern some of them; if there are any who usurp to themselves an absolute Power of interpreting the Laws of *Christ*. If by *Church* you mean the whole aggregate Body of true *Christians*, then we of the Laity, who are by a thousand Times the greatest Part of it, are so far concern'd
in

in the Case, that we ought to give his Lordship our hearty and sincere Thanks for pointing out to us our Rights, and shewing us that we ought to stand fast in that Liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, without consenting to be entangled in any Yoke of Bondage. But the Bishop's Doctrine seems to you to be level'd not only against our own *ecclesiastical Polity* but that of *all Churches that ever have been, either in the Days of the Apostles or any time since in any Nation of the World*; and they can have acted nothing (if his Lordship's Reasonings are right) but what is in direct Opposition to the Will of our blessed Saviour, and have usurp'd an Authority that he never delegated. Now, Doctor, if his Lordship's Reasonings are wrong, you shou'd have prov'd 'em so: If they are right, I don't care a Farthing what they overturn: Truth is and ought to be irresistible, and to throw down all Opposition before it. But suppose what general Councils, Synods, Canons, Articles and Creeds you please; if they are in the least Tittle repugnant to the Laws of *Christ*, you will grant, they are not to be obey'd: If I in my Conscience think they are repugnant to Scripture, it is the same

same thing, they cannot bind that Conscience that so thinks: Or if I shou'd assent to such Determinations with my Mouth and not with my Heart, shou'd I not be a Knave, a Hypocrite, a great Sinner? And the Bishop's Reasonings being against those who assume an absolute Power of determining the Sense of *Christ's* Laws as they think fit, and of forcing an outward Consent without an inward Conviction; Be they Councils or whatever else that have assum'd such a Power, his Lordship says they are acting in a Kingdom of their own and not in *Christ's*. And this you say must be destructive of all *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Can there then be no *Ecclesiastical Polity* without it? Sure there may.

You say the *Church*, after its State of Persecution, was to flourish, to have Kings for its nursing Fathers, &c. and then ask the Question, *And are the Rulers of the Earth now to be told that it is criminal in them to defend the Church?* Who has told 'em so? Why, the Bishop; say you. How has he told 'em so? Why he says, that it is Criminal to impose that upon Men's Consciences for the Law of *Christ*, which they cannot understand to be so; he says that *Christ's* Law ei-
ther

ther is compleat or he himself wou'd add more to it, but that no Men upon Earth have this Power: Now, if the *Clergy* have not this Power, and the Rulers of the Earth are told so, they are in Effect told that they must not defend the *Church*. Your humble Servant, Doctor; I find you can't mention the Word *Church* without meaning the *Clergy*. So that it amounts to this in reality, The Rulers of Earth are told, that it wou'd not only be Criminal in them to impose what they please as a Religious Creed upon the Consciences of their People, but likewise to protect their *Clergy* (if any such shou'd assume it) in the same Unreasonable and Tyrannical Usurpation. And certainly very fit it is they shou'd be told so; who are the Supreme Governours in all Causes Ecclesiastical and Temporal, by which the Peace and Quiet of their Realms may be advanced: Whose Business it is, not only to preserve to their People the Liberties and Immunities, the Covenants and Contracts of their Civil *Magna Charta* firm and inviolable; but also of that Religious *Magna Charta* the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*.

E

By

By this Time, Doctor, I am pretty near the Conclusion of your Letter and my own; heartily tir'd and fatigu'd I assure you. For dirty and foul has been the Way I have trod, as well as obscure and full of Error. But one thing more you take Notice of, and so will I. You offer his Lordship one Piece of Advice; that in the next Impression of his Sermon he wou'd not suffer his Bookseller to expose him by advertising his *Reasonableness of Conformity* at the Back of it. You think that very inconsistent with what his Lordship has lately written; I believe you did not consider the Import of the Word *Reasonableness*; it is what, Doctor, you seem to be very much a Stranger to; but what runs in a fair discernable Tenor thro' the whole Course of his Lordship's Writings. The same Reason which convinc'd his Lordship to conform, he offers to the Consideration of others: the same Reason which occasion'd his later Thoughts he offers to the World; it is *Reasonableness* in all and every Part; and, as you have not so much as pointed out the least Title to the contrary, you cannot say that it contradicts any other System of *Reasonableness*, which his Lordship has advanc'd.

And

And now I take my Leave, pitying the poor unfortunate Children, whose Lot it is to be drove by a Tyrant of so much Passion, Injustice, and Ill-Manners, or to be led by so blind a Guide. Who, I am sure, whatever Precedent else he may make of the Controversy between the Bishop of *Exeter*, and the late *Presbyter*, can pretend none for those rude Reproaches and uncivil Language which the present *Presbyter* has heap'd upon the Bishop of *Bangor*. But where am I going? I only intended to answer this Wise Man in his Wisdom; and am solicitous as if the Bishop needed a Defence, when not the least Argument he has us'd, has been struck at, or so much as touch'd. I must ask his Lordship's Pardon, that unacquainted as I am with him, I have so often made use of his Name upon an Occasion which I presume his Lordship will overlook with a just Contempt. And as for the Doctor, since he has given me this unexpected Trouble, I leave *Horace* to pass this Sentence upon him for his Pains.

Teque TIGELLI
Discipulorum interjubeo plorare Cathedras.

F I N I S.

